

applicability of certain boycott-related requirements of the boycotting country's laws in language reviewed in part 760, Supplement No. 1, Part II.B. and found to constitute a permissible agreement under the exception contained in §760.3(a) of this part for compliance with the import requirements of a boycotting country. The second and third paragraphs together deal with the procedure for selecting subcontractors and suppliers of services and goods and, in the context of the clause as a whole, must be regarded as motivated by boycott considerations and intended to enable the boycotting country government to make boycott-based selections, including the elimination of blacklisted subcontractors and suppliers.

The question is whether the incorporation into these paragraphs of some language from the "unilateral and specific selection" clause approved in Supplement No. 1 to part 760 suffices to take the language outside §760.2(a) of this part's prohibition on boycott-based agreements to refuse to do business. While the first sentence of this clause is consistent with the language discussed in Supplement No. 1 to part 760, the second sentence significantly alters the effect of this clause. The effect is to draw the contractor into the decision-making process, thereby destroying the unilateral character of the selection by the buyer. By agreeing to submit the names of the suppliers it plans to use, the contractor is agreeing to give the boycotting country buyer, who has retained the right of final selection, the ability to reject, for boycott-related reasons, any supplier the contractor has already chosen. Because the requirement appears in the contractual provision dealing with the boycott, the buyer's rejection of any supplier whose name is given to the buyer pursuant to this provision would be presumed to be boycott-based. By signing the contract, and thereby agreeing to comply with all of its provisions, the contractor must either accept the buyer's rejection of any supplier, which is presumed to be boycott-based because of the context of this provision, or breach the contract.

In these circumstances, the contractor's method of choosing its subcontractors and suppliers, in anticipation of the buyer's boycott-based review, cannot be considered a permissible pre-award service because of the presumed intrusion of boycott-based criteria into the selection process. Thus, assuming all other jurisdictional requirements necessary to establish a violation of part 760 are met, the signing of the contract by the contractor constitutes a violation of §760.2(a) of this part because he is agreeing to refuse to do business for boycott reasons.

The apparent attempt to bring this language within the exception for compliance with unilateral and specific selections is ineffective. The language does not place the discretion to choose suppliers in the hands of

the boycotting country buyer but divides this discretion between the buyer and his principal contractor. Knowing that the buyer will not accept a boycotted company as supplier or subcontractor, the contractor is asked to use his discretion in selecting a single supplier or subcontractor for each element of the contract. The boycotting country buyer exercises discretion only through accepting or rejecting the selected supplier or contractor as its boycott policies require. In these circumstances it cannot be said that the buyer is exercising right of unilateral and specific selection which meets the criteria of §760.3(d). For this reason, agreement to the contractual language discussed here would constitute an agreement to refuse to do business with any person rejected by the buyer and would violate §760.2(a) of this part.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34950, June 1, 2000]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 14 TO PART 760— INTERPRETATION

(a) *Contractual clause concerning import, customs and boycott laws of a boycotting country.* The following language has appeared in tender documents issued by a boycotting country:

"Supplier declares his knowledge of the fact that the import, Customs and boycott laws, rules and regulations of [name of boycotting country] apply in importing to [name of boycotting country]."

"Supplier declares his knowledge of the fact that under these laws, rules and regulations, it is prohibited to import into [name of the boycotting country] any products or parts thereof that originated in [name of boycotted country]; were manufactured, produced or imported by companies formed under the laws of [name of boycotted country]; or were manufactured, produced or imported by nationals or residents of [name of boycotted country]."

Agreeing to the above contractual language is a prohibited agreement to refuse to do business, under §760.2(a) of this part. The first paragraph requires broad acknowledgment of the application of the boycotting country's boycott laws, rules and regulations. Unless this language is qualified to apply only to boycott restrictions with which U.S. persons may comply, agreement to it is prohibited. See §760.2(a) of this part, examples (v) and (vi) under "Agreements to Refuse to Do Business."

The second paragraph does not limit the scope of the boycott restrictions referenced in the first paragraph. It states that the boycott laws include restrictions on goods originating in the boycotted country; manufactured, produced or supplied by companies organized under the laws of the boycotted

country; or manufactured, produced or supplied by nationals or residents of the boycotted country. Each of these restrictions is within the exception for compliance with the import requirements of the boycotting country (§ 760.3(a) of this part). However, the second paragraph's list of restrictions is not exclusive. Since the boycott laws generally include more than what is listed and permissible under the antiboycott law, U.S. persons may not agree to the quoted clause. For example, a country's boycott laws may prohibit imports of goods manufactured by blacklisted firms. Except as provided by § 760.3(g) of this part, agreement to and compliance with this boycott restriction would be prohibited under the antiboycott law.

The above contractual language is distinguished from the contract clause determined to be permissible in supplement 1, Part II, A, by its acknowledgment that the boycott requirements of the boycotting country apply. Although the first sentence of the Supplement 1 clause does not exclude the possible application of boycott laws, it refers only to the import and customs laws of the boycotting country without mentioning the boycott laws as well. As discussed fully in Supplement No. 1 to part 760, compliance with or agreement to the clause quoted there is, therefore, permissible.

The contract clause quoted above, as well as the clause dealt with in Supplement No. 1 to part 760, part II, A, is reportable under § 760.5(a)(1) of this part.

(b) *Letter of credit terms removing blacklist certificate requirement if specified vessels used.* The following terms frequently appear on letters of credit covering shipment to Iraq:

"Shipment to be effected by Iraqi State Enterprise for Maritime Transport Vessels or by United Arab Shipping Company (SAB) vessels, if available."

"If shipment is effected by any of the above company's [sic] vessels, black list certificate or evidence to that effect is not required."

These terms are not reportable and compliance with them is permissible.

The first sentence, a directive to use Iraqi State Enterprise for Maritime Transport or United Arab Shipping vessels, is neither reportable nor prohibited because it is not considered by the Department to be boycott-related. The apparent reason for the directive is Iraq's preference to have cargo shipped on its own vessels (or, as in the case of United Arab Shipping, on vessels owned by a company in part established and owned by the Iraqi government). Such "cargo preference" requirements, calling for the use of an importing or exporting country's own ships, are common throughout the world and are imposed for non-boycott reasons. (See § 760.2(a) of this part, example (vii) AGREEMENTS TO REFUSE TO DO BUSINESS.)

In contrast, if the letter of credit contains a list of vessels or carriers that appears to constitute a boycott-related whitelist, a directive to select a vessel from that list would be both reportable and prohibited. When such a directive appears in conjunction with a term removing the blacklist certificate requirement if these vessels are used, the Department will presume that beneficiaries, banks and any other U.S. person receiving the letter of credit know that there is a boycott-related purpose for the directive.

The second sentence of the letter of credit language quoted above does not, by itself, call for a blacklist certificate and is not therefore, reportable. If a term elsewhere on the letter of credit imposes a blacklist certificate requirement, then that other term would be reportable.

(c) *Information not related to a particular transaction in U.S. commerce.* Under § 760.2 (c), (d) and (e), of this part U.S. persons are prohibited, with respect to their activities in U.S. commerce, from furnishing certain information. It is the Department's position that the required nexus with U.S. commerce is established when the furnishing of information itself occurs in U.S. commerce. Even when the furnishing of information is not itself in U.S. commerce, however, the necessary relationship to U.S. commerce will be established if the furnishing of information relates to particular transactions in U.S. commerce or to anticipated transactions in U.S. commerce. See, e.g. § 760.2(d), examples (vii), (ix) and (xii) of this part.

The simplest situation occurs where a U.S. person located in the United States furnishes information to a boycotting country. The transfer of information from the United States to a foreign country is itself an activity in U.S. commerce. See § 760.1(d)(1)(iv) of this part. In some circumstances, the furnishing of information by a U.S. person located outside the United States may also be an activity in U.S. commerce. For example, the controlled foreign subsidiary of a domestic concern might furnish to a boycotting country information the subsidiary obtained from the U.S.-located parent for that purpose. The subsidiary's furnishing would, in these circumstances, constitute an activity in U.S. commerce. See § 760.1(d)(8) of this part.

Where the furnishing of information is not itself in U.S. commerce, the U.S. commerce requirement may be satisfied by the fact that the furnishing is related to an activity in U.S. foreign or domestic commerce. For example, if a shipment of goods by a controlled-in-fact foreign subsidiary of a U.S. company to a boycotting country gives rise to an inquiry from the boycotting country concerning the subsidiary's relationship with another firm, the Department regards any responsive furnishing of information by the subsidiary as related to the shipment giving

rise to the inquiry. If the shipment is in U.S. foreign or domestic commerce, as defined by the regulations, then the Department regards the furnishing to be related to an activity in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations, whether or not the furnishing itself is in U.S. commerce.

In some circumstances, the Department may regard a furnishing of information as related to a broader category of present and prospective transactions. For example, if a controlled-in-fact foreign subsidiary of a U.S. company is requested to furnish information about its commercial dealings and it appears that failure to respond will result in its blacklisting, any responsive furnishing of information will be regarded by the Department as relating to all of the subsidiary's present and anticipated business activities with the inquiring boycotting country. Accordingly, if any of these present or anticipated business activities are in U.S. commerce, the Department will regard the furnishing as related to an activity in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations.

In deciding whether anticipated business activities will be in U.S. commerce, the Department will consider all of the surrounding circumstances. Particular attention will be given to the history of the U.S. person's business activities with the boycotting country and others, the nature of any activities occurring after a furnishing of information occurs and any relevant economic or commercial factors which may affect these activities.

For example, if a U.S. person has no activities with the boycotting country at present but all of its other international activities are in U.S. commerce, as defined by the Regulations, then the Department is likely to regard any furnishing of information by that person for the purpose of securing entry into the boycotting country's market as relating to anticipated activities in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations. Similarly, if subsequent to the furnishing of information to the boycotting country for the purpose of securing entry into its markets, the U.S. person engages in transactions with that country which are in U.S. commerce, the Department is likely to regard the furnishing as related to an activity in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34950, June 1, 2000]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 15 TO PART 760— INTERPRETATION

Section 760.2 (c), (d), and (e) of this part prohibits United States persons from furnishing certain types of information with intent to comply with, further, or support an

unsanctioned foreign boycott against a country friendly to the United States. The Department has been asked whether prohibited information may be transmitted—that is, passed to others by a United States person who has not directly or indirectly authored the information—without such transmission constituting a furnishing of information in violation of §760.2 (c), (d), and (e) of this part. Throughout this interpretation, “transmission” is defined as the passing on by one person of information initially authored by another. The Department believes that there is no distinction in the EAR between transmitting (as defined above) and furnishing prohibited information under the EAR and that the transmission of prohibited information with the requisite boycott intent is a furnishing of information violative of the EAR. At the same time, however, the circumstances relating to the transmitting party's involvement will be carefully considered in determining whether that party intended to comply with, further, or support an unsanctioned foreign boycott.

The EAR does not deal specifically with the relationship between transmitting and furnishing. However, the restrictions in the EAR on responses to boycott-related conditions, both by direct and indirect actions and whether by primary parties or intermediaries, indicate that U.S. persons who simply transmit prohibited information are to be treated the same under the EAR as those who both author and furnish prohibited information. This has been the Department's position in enforcement actions it has brought.

The few references in the EAR to the transmission of information by third parties are consistent with this position. Two examples, both relating to the prohibition against the furnishing of information about U.S. persons' race, religion, sex, or national origin (§760.2(c) of this part), deal explicitly with transmitting information. These examples (§760.2(c) of this part, example (v), and §760.3(f) of this part, example (vi)) show that, in certain cases, when furnishing certain information is permissible, either because it is not within a prohibition or is excepted from a prohibition, transmitting it is also permissible. These examples concern information that may be furnished by individuals about themselves or their families. The examples show that employers may transmit to a boycotting country visa applications or forms containing information about an employee's race, religion, sex, or national origin if that employee is the source of the information and authorizes its transmission. In other words, within the limits of ministerial action set forth in these examples, employees' actions in transmitting information are protected by the exception available to the employee. The distinction between permissible